

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-5 are amended. Claims 6-13 are new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,438,625 B1) in view of Gleeson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,023). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Olson at best appears to disclose that the backplane (e.g. primary backplane or secondary backplane) is only used for wiring (e.g. by buses, see Olson: column 4, lines 11-35). Claim 1 is directed to a method that utilizes a centralized exchanging and controlling unit that receives a message, processes the message and forwards the processed message between modules. Thus, Applicant submits that Olson fails to teach or suggest the setting step as well as the communicating step of claim 1.

Olson at best appears to disclose a computer controlled system having two or more secondary backplanes that are plugged into slots in a primary backplane. The secondary backplanes is only used for wiring (for example, by buses) and does not perform functions as those of the claimed modules. The boards inserted in secondary backplane slots are connected to the primary backplane slot by buses in the secondary backplane (see Olson: FIGs. 3 and 4). In contrast, in claim 1, each module of the

system device is connected with the centralized exchanging and controlling unit separately through a respective communication control interface of each module. Thus, Applicant submits that Olson fails to teach or suggest the connecting step of claim 1.

Gleeson at best appears to disclose that a switch is connected to network devices in a communication system or a network. The switch processes a packet sent from a source device upon receiving the packet, and forwards the processed packet to a destination device (see Gleeson: Abstract). In claim 1, the centralized exchanging and controlling unit connects to each module in a system device; a source module sends a message to the centralized exchanging and controlling unit; the centralized exchanging and controlling unit processes the message and forwards the processed message to a destination module.

Further, Olson appears to disclose providing contiguous addresses for boards on the secondary backplane that inserted in the primary backplane slot (Olson, Abstract). Gleeson appears to disclose implementing communication between network devices in a communication system or a network, so that the network devices can communicate with each other by means of a switch without the aid of a router (Gleeson: Fig. 9 and page 12, lines 17-20). In contrast, claim 1 is directed to a method that can implement reliable communications among modules in a system device. Some embodiments of the claimed invention may easily locate a fault; the number of the modules in communication is not limited; the system design is simpler, easier and more flexible.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 defines over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, also define over the art cited by the Examiner.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 6-13 are new. Applicant submits the argument presented above apply here equally.

In addition, Olsson at best appears to disclose that the primary address pins in the primary backplane slot are combined with secondary address pins in the slot of the secondary backplane to define the address of each board inserted in the secondary backplane slot. The primary backplane slot has a range of addresses (e. g., see Olson: Table 1, the first primary board slot into which a secondary backplane is inserted provides addresses from 00001-01010) instead of one address. In other words, one secondary backplane has multiple addresses. In contrast, in claims 6 and 10, a module connected to the corresponding communication control interface corresponds to its own address. Therefore, Olson fails to anticipate the limitations of “before communicating between the modules, presetting a state of address pins of each of the modules, each of the modules getting its own address by reading the current state of its own address pins”.

Gleeson at best appears to disclose that a packet needs to contain a media access control address. If the packet does not contain a media access control address, the packet needs to include a protocol address and it is necessary to perform an address resolution protocol to enable the destination station reply with its own media access control address (Gleeson: Fig. 9 and, page 1, line 22, page 2, line 2). In contrast, in claims 6 and 10, the message carries an address of the destination module, which is represented by the state of address pins of the destination module. Applicant

submits that a person skilled in the art would appreciate that the communications between modules inside a system device and communications between system devices in a network differ.

Further, in claims 6 and 10, before communicating between the modules, a state of address pins of each module is preset, and each module gets its own address by reading the current state of its own address pins. Applicant submits that the address of each module in claim 1 differs from the media access control address of each network device in Gleeson, because in a network or a communication system, as known by one skilled in the art, a media access control address of a network device with a network interface card is set by the manufacturer of the network interface card and is globally unique. In contrast, the address of each module in claim 1 is preset inside a system device. Therefore, Gleeson also fails to disclose the limitations of “before communicating between the modules, presetting a state of address pins of each module for each module, each module getting its own address by reading the current state of its own address pins”.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-9 as well as claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-13 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 12, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm